

Judge Ronald B. Leighton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	NO. CR05-5785RBL
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER OF CONTINUANCE
SUZETTE BLAND,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

Before this Court is a Stipulated Motion to Extend the Pretrial Motions Deadline and to Continue the Trial Date;

The Court finds, after a consideration of all relevant information and the circumstances of this case, that the ends of justice would best be served by the granting of this request for continuance. The ends of justice outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendant in having the matter brought to trial sooner.

The Court finds that the parties' request to extend the deadline for pretrial motions should be GRANTED. The pretrial motions deadline scheduled for November 30, 2005, is VACATED. The **pretrial motions deadline** is continued to **January 31, 2006**.

For all the reasons presented in the files and records herein, the Court finds that the parties' stipulated request to continue the trial should be GRANTED. The trial date currently scheduled for January 17, 2006, is VACATED. **Trial** shall be rescheduled to **April 3, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.** The **Pretrial Conference** is rescheduled to **February 28, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.**

Any and all period of delay resulting from the granting of this continuance, from the date of the filing of the parties stipulated request on December 16, 2005, until April 3, 2006, shall be excludable time pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(1)(F) and (h)(8)(A), and the Court makes the following findings:

a. That the failure to grant such a continuance in this case would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(i);

b. That it is in the defendant's best interest to be aware of all of the potential charges against her and to have the opportunity to negotiate settlements on all of those charges;

c. That the failure to grant such a continuance in this case would deny counsel for the Defendant and the Government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, because of the existence of a significant amount of complex discovery including extensive medical records; 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv);

d. That because of ongoing negotiations and other discovery matters it may be unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii).

IT IS SO ORDERED this 23rd day of December, 2005.

  
RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

s/Norman M. Barbosa  
NORMAN M. BARBOSA  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

s/Anna K. Woods  
ANNA K. WOODS

s/James B. Feldman  
JAMES B. FELDMAN  
Attorneys for the Defendant